

Calendar No. 483

98TH CONGRESS }
1st Session

SENATE

{ REPORT
No. 98-274

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1984

OCTOBER 19 (legislative day, OCTOBER 17), 1983.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 3958]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 3958) making appropriations for water resource development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

COMPARISON OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, RECOMMENDED IN BILL

Amount of bill as passed by House	\$118,946,000
Budget estimates considered by House	51,320,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	51,320,000
Amount of bill recommended to the Senate	78,000,000
Comparison of the bill as reported to the Senate with:	
Budget estimate	+ 26,680,000
House-passed bill	- 40,946,000

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to provide funding to initiate construction of new water resource development projects and to continue planning, engineering, and design on other projects nearing readiness to begin construction. The projects funded in the bill include a number proposed by the administration in the fiscal year 1983 or 1984 Presidential budget request and a number of other high priority projects included on the initiative of the Committee.

The future well-being of this Nation depends upon what we do today to develop the necessary underlying infrastructure which supports our way of life and economic prosperity.

The Congress of the United States can be proud of the completed water resource development projects in all 50 States. They stand as an eloquent monument to the vision and commitment of those who foresaw the need for public development for a viable inland waterway system, vital flood control and water supply facilities, hydroelectric and irrigation facilities which provide widespread public benefits, and coastal ports and harbors that provide for our economic well-being.

The projects funded in this bill are an integral part of the overall national water resource development program that is embodied in the annual Energy and Water Development Appropriation bills. The regular fiscal year 1984 appropriation provided \$3,600,000,000 for planning, construction, and maintenance of water resource development projects in every State of the Union.

While it is unusual for the Appropriations Committee to report a bill of this type separate from the regular appropriations measures, it is necessary to do so because of the many requirements throughout the Nation to provide for flood control, port development, water supply, and navigation improvement.

NEED FOR WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Water is our Nation's most precious resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens urban areas with floods and carries away precious topsoil from rural areas. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability or control of water affects and benefits all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically and continues to assume much of the responsibility for financing of water resource development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is the most impressive in the history of man. This vast system of dams, locks,

harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites has one central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transport of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and for making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide for hydroelectric power generation and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for millions of urban and rural residents, and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development.

Benefits provided by projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers are typical of such investments. For example, flood control projects have prevented damages in excess of \$100,000,000,000 based on an investment of about \$20,000,000,000, and virtually all of these projects will continue to provide increasing benefits in the years to come. The following indicates the types and magnitude of benefits provided by water resource projects:

- Flood control projects that cost \$19,500,000,000 have prevented flood damage losses in excess of \$105,000,000,000 through fiscal year 1982;
- Navigation facilities constructed and operated by the Corps carry 1,941,000,000 tons of cargo annually;
- Corps facilities provide storage for 2,500,000,000,000 gallons of water for water supply purposes;
- Corps hydroelectric facilities which generated 76,500,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity in fiscal year 1982 have produced \$3,900,000,000 in revenues through fiscal year 1982; and
- Corps facilities provided 480,000,000 recreation days in 1982.

The benefits provided by Bureau of Reclamation projects through fiscal year 1982 include:

- Provided full irrigation service to 5,077,100 acres, and a supplemental water supply to 5,756,700 acres.
- Provided 98,800,000 acre-feet of active capacity on constructed storage reservoirs for water supply.
- An investment of \$900,000,000 has provided cumulative flood control benefits of over \$2,200,000,000.
- Annually provided 4,037,579 acre-feet of municipal and industrial water and 12,754,900 kilowatts of hydroelectric power.

NEED FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS

Water resource development in the United States is a continuing and evolving process that requires our constant vigilance. While the accomplishments of previous water resource development efforts are impres-

sive, as just indicated, the needs and demands for water supply, navigation, flood and erosion control, port and other development are constantly changing and growing.

But the infrastructure needs of this great Nation have been neglected for far too long. The Committee doubts that anyone would seriously suggest otherwise. Since 1980, the Corps of Engineers has started construction on only 1 project while completing construction on 73 with another 12 projects scheduled for completion by the end of the current fiscal year and the actual construction appropriation has been reduced from \$1,600,000,000 in 1980 to \$884,000,000 in 1984. Yet in real terms, the value of the 1984 construction program, based on 1965 dollars, is less than \$300,000,000.

It should also be pointed out that major replacement and modernization work needs to be undertaken at critical structures associated with the Nation's inland waterway system, 42 percent of which are more than 40 years old. In addition, the President discussed in his state of the Union address, the need to upgrade the ports and harbors in this country. If broader policy issues can be resolved, substantial additional funds will be required to address the problem of deteriorated, obsolete, and inadequate facilities which underpin this country.

As a result of differences between the executive and legislative branches on cost sharing and financing of new projects, the funding of new starts has essentially been at a standstill for the past 4 years. This problem has been further compounded by the lack of authorization of new projects in the past 7 years, and the realization that it has been 13 years since the last major construction authorization. Therefore, many urgent needs nationwide have not been addressed.

The Committee has recognized the current conditions and needs, and is responding with this initial appropriations measure which reverses the inaction of past years.

Recent action on authorization legislation by both Houses of Congress is an important step toward achieving a resolution of these problems. The passage and enactment of water resource authorization legislation is critical to the well-being of the Nation and the probability that legislation will be presented to both Houses of Congress for consideration is encouraging.

Accordingly, the Committee believes that this is the appropriate time to provide funds for new construction starts. These projects include a number of projects proposed by the administration in fiscal years 1983 and 1984, other authorized projects which are worthy of construction, and urgently needed projects which are awaiting authorization. It is the Committee's intent that more detailed design be prepared for projects in order to assure that a continuing pipeline of projects is available to progress toward construction. The Committee is confident that every effort will be made by the 98th Congress to enact legislation authorizing new projects and, where appropriate, make adjustments in cost sharing. Use of funds provided by this bill for construction of unauthorized projects is subject to authorizing legislation where appropriate. Moreover, adjustments in cost sharing enacted during this Congress would

apply to the projects funded herein to include those presently authorized, as would project related expenditures under the terms of the authorization.

The Committee does not object to the administration negotiating or accepting additional financial participation from local sponsors, beyond current authorized requirements, on those projects which were budgeted as new construction starts in fiscal years 1983 and 1984.

STATUS OF AUTHORIZATION

The Water Resources Subcommittee of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee has been working diligently over the past several months to develop a meaningful omnibus authorization bill. The subcommittee has had several markup sessions on S. 1739 which is expected to be acted on by the full committee and reported to the Senate in the near future.

The Appropriations Committee supports and encourages the work of the authorizing committee, but cannot ignore the enormous pressure being exerted by Members to fill the void created by lack of omnibus water resources legislation.

Work on S. 1739 represents a major effort and commitment by the Water Resources Subcommittee to initiate new water resource development projects and to address in a comprehensive manner the major policy questions of project financing and cost sharing.

The Committee recognizes the responsibility of the authorization committees to establish cost-sharing policies, but is concerned that an overzealous application of rigid cost-sharing requirements would create a situation of have versus have-nots. Many States and localities do not have the capability to share costs to the same extent, if at all, that others may have. This is particularly undesirable in the case of flood control projects where human lives and the economic viability of communities are involved. Because of this, the Committee encourages a flexible approach to cost sharing.

BUDGETARY LIMITATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The Committee action on H.R. 3958 has been carefully developed to conform to budgetary considerations and available allocations for direct spending, while also addressing the priority concerns of the various Members of Congress.

While the Committee has received numerous requests from Members, State and local officials, and others to fund new construction projects, the number of water resource development projects that can be funded in any particular fiscal year is limited. Even with incremental funding, the large number of highly important, necessary projects; and the high cost of many of them limit the total number that can be recommended at any one time.

Because of the ongoing need to address the critical problem of rebuilding the infrastructure of the country, it is the Committee's intent to recommend funds for additional new projects in future appropriation bills.

The Committee recommendation of \$78,000,000 brings the total energy and water appropriations for 1984 to \$14,385,045,000 which is \$225,572,000 below the administrations budget request for fiscal 1984. The amounts recommended are also within the allocations for budget authority under section 302(b) of the Budget Act.

BILL SUMMARY

The Committee recommendation deletes 20 projects included in the House-passed bill which have a total estimated Federal cost of \$1,249,000,000. Of the projects included by the Committee 12 require further action by the appropriate authorizing committees, compared to 20 included by the House.

The Committee recommendation totals \$78,000,000 including \$70,000,000 for 24 projects of the Corps of Engineers and \$8,000,000 for 3 projects of the Bureau of Reclamation.

In recommending changes to the House action, the Committee was required to make a judgment on each individual project. That judgment, and resulting decision, was made after careful review of the status of each project and several other factors including the availability of a current, approved project report by the Chief of Engineers; favorable benefit-cost analysis; national and regional economic development considerations; and the degree of State and local support. In addition, many of the projects included by the House required significant additional planning and engineering before construction could begin.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Committee recommends \$70,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers, which is \$33,096,000 below the House bill.

Inland waterway system improvements.—The recommendation presented to the Senate does not include locks and dam 7 and 8 on the Monongahela River, and the William Oliver lock and dam on the Black Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. However, the Committee wishes to express, in the strongest way, its support for each of these projects.

All information to date indicates that these projects are economically feasible and necessary to eliminate future obstructions and navigation delays. Final reports and recommendations of the Chief of Engineers are expected by the end of 1984 and the Corps of Engineers should continue to expedite the processing and review of each project report. The Committee believes, however, that a final recommendation by the Chief of Engineers is important before proceeding with construction.

Were it not for the lack of a final, approved report by the Chief of Engineers, the Committee would have included these projects in its recommendation. The Committee expects to provide initial construction funding at the earliest possible time after an approved project report is available.

Municipal water supply loan program.—The Committee is aware that a new municipal water supply loan program is currently included in proposed authorizing legislation in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Both bills establish the responsibility of the Secretary of the

Army and the Corps of Engineers for considering loan applications and distributing appropriated funds. Because single purpose municipal water supply projects have traditionally been outside the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, the implementation of a loan program will require new plans and procedures.

It is the intention of the Committee that the Secretary and the Corps should initiate planning so as to be prepared to administer a program as soon as possible after the enactment of authorizing legislation and the subsequent appropriation of funds, including such preparations to establish within the Corps any procedures and organizational changes which would be necessary for the prompt implementation of the municipal water supply loan program. The Secretary and the Corps are to report to Congress in connection with testimony on the fiscal year 1985 budget on the resources available at the Corps to implement such a loan program and on any additional resources and requirements which would be necessary.

A brief summary of each project for which funds are recommended follows:

ALABAMA

Mobile Harbor, Ala.—Mobile Harbor is in southwestern Alabama at the junction of Mobile River and Mobile Bay. The harbor serves Mobile and an extensive portion of the United States. The southern end of Mobile Bay opens into the Gulf of Mexico. The proposed improvement provides for deepening the existing main ship channel from 40 feet to 55 feet. Current problems attending navigation relate to efficiency of operation, maneuvering difficulties, and higher transportation costs which result from the need to use smaller and/or light-loaded vessels in serving the port. Changes in both vessel characteristics and commodity movements indicate that modifications to the harbor are necessary to maintain efficient, safe, and economical operations. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, November 18, 1981)

ARKANSAS

Eight Mile Creek, Ark.—The project is located in northeast Arkansas and includes portions of Greene and Craighead Counties in the vicinity of Paragould, Ark. The plan of improvement consists of channel enlargement on 11.4 miles of streams. This includes 8 miles of channel improvement in the agricultural area below Paragould to provide a 3-year level of protection and 3.4 miles of channel improvement to provide a 100-year level of protection to the urban area of Paragould.

During the last 40 years, major floods in the basin have been reported every 4 to 12 years. One of the most recent floods to occur in the Eight Mile Creek basin was in April 1973, when 6.77 inches of rain fell in 16 hours. About 3,000 persons were forced from their homes and the ensuing damages to homes and businesses were estimated by local officials to be \$3,600,000. Updating this damage to October 1982 price levels brings the amount to \$12,300,000. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, August 10, 1979)

CALIFORNIA

Bodega Bay, Calif.—The project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1965, is located in Sonoma County on the California coast about 58 miles north of San Francisco. The proposed project provides navigation improvements near Spud Point, consisting of a dredged channel (1,960 feet by 100 feet by 12 feet) and a breakwater 1,306 feet long. Bodega Bay Harbor serves as an important fishing center and harbor of refuge on the northern California coast. It is the only improved harbor between San Francisco Bay and Noyo Harbor, a reach of about 143 miles.

Fisherman's Wharf area, Calif.—The project is located in San Francisco Bay, on the San Francisco Harbor waterfront of the city and county of San Francisco, near the Golden Gate. The recommended plan consists of a concrete breakwater 1,900 feet long at the existing Hyde Street Pier and a concrete breakwater 370 feet long attached to existing Pier 45. The plan of improvement would provide protection to the Fisherman's Wharf area which is part of a densely developed heavily populated area that includes a network of piers, wharves, and berthing areas which are essentially unprotected from wave damage. During winter storms, waves in the bay may reach heights up to 5.5 feet. The wharf area, which includes two light-draft berthing basins for commercial fishing boats with a total capacity of 170 berths, is exposed to wave action from both the open ocean and local storms and is the most vulnerable small-craft harbor in San Francisco Bay. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, February 3, 1978 and June 7, 1979)

Merced County Streams, Calif.—The project authorized by the 1970 Flood Control Act, is located in Merced County in the vicinity of the city of Merced, Calif., on the streams draining from the Mariposa County foothills of the Sierra Nevada into Merced County. The plan of improvement provides for construction of two new dams and modification of one existing dam, approximately 33.4 miles of levee, and channel improvement on Bear, Cottonwood, Fahrens, and Black Rascal Creek. The project will provide flood protection to residential, commercial, and agricultural lands within and adjacent to the city of Merced and Castle Air Force Base. The population of Merced County was 90,440 in 1960, increased to 140,700 by 1982, and is expected to reach 177,000 by 2000. Rapid urbanization is increasing the severity of serious flooding problems that exist along the streams draining from the Sierra Nevada into Merced County.

Sacramento River Deep Water Channel, Calif.—The project area extends from Avon in Suisun Bay to Collinsville and in the existing Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel from Collinsville to the Port of Sacramento, Calif. The recommended project consists primarily of deepening to 35 feet the Suisun Bay and existing Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel from New York Slough to the Port of Sacramento, and the Avon to New York Slough reach to 35 feet which will be accomplished under the San Francisco Bay to Stockton project. Problems and needs associated with waterborne transportation in the existing Sacramento River Deep Water Channel results from inadequate

waterways and related facilities to accommodate vessels currently using the channel thus causing inefficiencies and unsafe conditions. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, November 20, 1981)

FLORIDA

Dade County, north of Haulover Beach Park, Fla.—Dade County is located on the Atlantic Ocean near the southern tip of the Florida Peninsula. The existing Federal beach erosion control and hurricane protection project extends north along the Atlantic Coast of Dade County 9.3 miles from Government Cut to Bakers Haulover Inlet, thence north from Bakers Haulover Inlet 1.2 miles to the north boundary of Haulover Beach Park. The combined effect of wind, waves, and tides amplified during storm conditions has resulted in erosion and lowering of the beach profiles and recession of the shoreline. At a large number of locations along the shoreline, erosion has undermined or threatened to undermine shorefront structures. Recession of the shoreline is causing the loss of valuable property and at many locations placing seawalls under direct wave attack. There is now little or no protective and recreational beach during periods of high tides in certain reaches of the commercially developed strip and in the north section of Golden Beach. (Report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, January 19, 1983)

HAWAII

Kahoma Stream, Hawaii.—The project, authorized in 1976 under section 201 of the 1965 Flood Control Act, is located in the town of Lahaina on the west coast of the island of Maui, Hawaii. The plan of improvement provides for construction of 5,415 feet of concrete trapezoidal channel, a debris basin, a revetted outlet, and three bridges. Flood damages in the Kahoma Stream basin result from inadequate capacity of the channel and bridge openings, restrictive bends in the stream, and high velocity flows. The greatest flood on record occurred on May 13, 1960, with an estimated peak flow of 7,750 cfs and with damages of \$320,000 at the time. Presently there are 360 homes, 18 condominiums, 280 commercial establishments, two shopping centers, several small businesses, and a sugar processing plant valued at \$100,000,000 in the Kahoma Stream flood plain.

ILLINOIS

Locks and dam No. 26, Alton, Ill. and Mo., second lock, including environmental management.—Appropriations of funds for both lock and dam 26 (second lock) and environmental management of the Upper Mississippi River System, subject to enactment of specific authorizing legislation, insures the coordinated development and enhancement of the system as both a nationally significant ecosystem and a nationally significant commercial navigation system.

It is the Committee's intent that initial planning and design of the navigation and environmental improvements in fiscal year 1984 are to be undertaken simultaneously on equal fiscal footing to the extent prac-

licable and engineeringly feasible. This process represents a commitment to the balanced use, development, and protection of the river resources recommended for the management of the Upper Mississippi River System in pending authorizing legislation.

This advanced engineering and design work provides for the timely construction of the recommended project upon enactment of the required legislation. Furthermore, it provides a like amount to the Secretary of the Army, including sums for use by transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, for initial activities related to programs for long-term resource monitoring, habitat rehabilitation and enhancement, recreation improvements and studies, traffic monitoring, and computerized inventory and analysis. It is the intent of Congress to implement such programs so that significant progress be made in advance of navigation capacity expansion resulting from the use of the new locks at lock and dam 26.

Locks and dam No. 26, second lock, would be located adjacent to the lock and dam 26 (replacement) in the Mississippi River at Madison County, Ill., and St. Charles County, Mo., river mile 200.8 above the mouth of the Ohio River in the vicinity of Alton, Ill., approximately 2 miles downstream from the existing locks and dam 26. Locks and dam No. 26 are strategic to the movement of commodities up and down the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. Any disruption of the single-lock operation could bring shipping to a halt. A second lock, 600 feet in length, would be capable of keeping traffic moving and minimizing delays that could result during routine maintenance or as a result of unexpected emergencies that could occur in the main lock. In addition, the second lock would increase the capacity to pass traffic on the river.

LOUISIANA

Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, La.—The Atchafalaya Basin project, authorized in 1928, is one of the main stem components of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project. Through a system of levees, channels, and control works, the basin serves as a floodway to carry up to one-half of the Mississippi River floodflows. Physically, the Atchafalaya River Basin project is about 60 percent complete. An important element of the plan involves the purchase of approximately 48,000 acres of land from willing sellers to be used as a natural wildlife area and funds are provided for that purpose. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, February 28, 1983)

Mississippi River Ship Channel, Gulf to Baton Rouge, La.—The project is located in the southeastern portion of Louisiana below Baton Rouge, consisting of the Mississippi River, and its outlets to the Gulf of Mexico. The project will provide more efficient deep-draft navigation access to the New Orleans and Baton Rouge reaches of the Mississippi River via Southwest Pass by enlarging the existing channel to a project depth of 55 feet and enlarging the adjacent channel along the left descending bank in New Orleans Harbor to a 40-foot depth, a turning basin at Baton Rouge, and training works in the passes to reduce maintenance. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, April 9, 1983)

MAINE

Jonesport Harbor, Maine.—Jonesport Harbor, authorized in 1976 under section 201 of the 1965 Flood Control Act, is located on the Atlantic Ocean at the north side of Moosabec Reach in Washington County, Maine, about 190 miles northeast of Portland, Maine, and about 40 miles southwest of the Canadian border at Eastport, Maine. The project provides for a breakwater 1,200 feet in length; a 15-acre anchorage composed of 9 acres, 6 feet deep, and 6 acres, 8 feet deep; and an entrance channel 100 feet wide and 8 feet deep. The basic need in Jonesport Harbor is for a protected anchorage to adequately and safely accommodate the local fishing fleet.

MARYLAND

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md. and Va.—Baltimore Harbor is situated at the head of the navigable portion of the Patapsco River, approximately 172 miles north of the Virginia Capes entrance to Chesapeake Bay. The project lies in Baltimore City and Anne Arundel and Baltimore Counties in Maryland, and Northampton and Accomack Counties in Virginia. The proposed improvement authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1970, would provide for a uniform main channel, 50 feet deep and generally 800 or 1,000 feet wide, through the Chesapeake Bay from the Virginia Capes to Fort McHenry in the Port of Baltimore. Depths of 50, 49, and 40 feet would be provided in the branch channels of Curtis Bay, Northwest Branch-East Channel, and Northwest Branch-West Channel, respectively.

MINNESOTA

Bassett Creek, Minn.—The project, authorized in the 1976 Water Resource Development Act, is located in Hennepin County, Minn., and consists of structural and nonstructural flood control measures. Structural measures consists of six small control structures to temporarily impound floodwaters and a new tunnel to replace the existing tunnel outletting Bassett Creek to the Mississippi River. Flood damages presently average \$1,852,000 annually. The recommended project would provide flood protection to 222 residences and 18 industries and an indeterminate number of commercial and industrial developments in Minneapolis. The project would prevent approximately \$3,055,000 in average annual flood damages.

MISSISSIPPI

Gulfport Harbor, Miss.—The project is located on Mississippi Sound, an arm of the Gulf of Mexico, about 44 miles west of Pascagoula Harbor, Miss., and 78 miles east of New Orleans, La. The existing project consists of: a channel 32 feet deep, 300 feet wide and about 8 miles long across Ship Island Bar; a channel 30 feet deep, 220 feet wide, and about 11 miles long through Mississippi Sound; an anchorage basin at Gulfport 30 feet deep, 1,320 feet wide, and 2,640 feet long. Modifications of the project would provide for deepening and widening the existing ship channel to 36 by 300 feet in Mississippi Sound and 36 by

400 feet in the Gulf of Mexico with necessary changes in the channel alinement and in the entrance to the anchorage basin needed for reasonably safe and unrestricted navigation. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, November 28, 1978)

NEW JERSEY

Liberty State Park levee and seawall, N.J.—The State of New Jersey's plan for Liberty State park will transform a decaying open space into a new and useful waterfront area. Opposite two national monuments, the park will offer public access to the waterfront and new recreational activities at the center of the New Jersey-New York metropolitan region. The project is located in Jersey City, Hudson County, N.J., directly opposite the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island in upper New York Bay. The proposed plan of improvement consists of excavation, landfill, placement of an armored sand levee, and construction of two pedestrian walkways spanning the unfilled areas. It extends 1.5 miles in a crescent alinement from the shoreline south of the Railroad Maritime Terminal to the north side of Black Tom Channel. (Water Resource Development Act of 1976)

NEW YORK

Ellicott Creek, N.Y.—The project consists of about 2.1 miles of channel widening and deepening, including the enlargement of the existing diversion channel in Ellicott Creek Park and about 2.1 miles of diversion channels outside the existing creek channel.

The project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended by Public Law 97-128, is needed to reduce flood damages in the lower Ellicott Creek basin. The downstream portion of the Ellicott Creek basin is subject to frequent flooding. The March 1960 flood inundated about 20 acres in the city and town of Tonawanda and flooded about 3,200 acres in the town of Amherst. The flood problem has become more acute in recent years due to increased development activity which includes the Amherst Campus of the State University of New York at Buffalo. The project would prevent approximately \$1,750,000 in average annual flood damages.

Moriches Inlet, N.Y.—Moriches Inlet is an opening through the narrow, sandy barrier beach on the south shore of Long Island which separates the Atlantic Ocean from a series of interconnected bays. The inlet is in Suffolk County and is 80 miles by water east of the Battery, New York City. The project provides for an entrance channel 10 feet deep and 200 feet wide from the Atlantic Ocean to Moriches Bay, and an inner channel 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the bay to the Long Island Intercoastal Waterway.

The U.S. Coast Guard notifies mariners that conditions at Moriches Inlet are extremely hazardous and that navigation of the inlet is considered unsafe at any time. The plan of improvement would provide adequate and safe access for boats. Also the project would provide refuge and reduce storm damage to vessels. (1960 River and Harbor Act)

OHIO

Gallipolis locks and dam, Ohio and W. Va. (Ohio River).—Gallipolis is situated in the middle Ohio Valley at river mile 279.2, about 14 miles downstream from the mouth of the Kanawha River in West Virginia and about 30 miles upstream from the city of Huntington, W. Va. The new locks would be in Mason County, W. Va.; the abutment of the dam is in Gallia County, Ohio. The proposed plan of improvement includes construction of two new locks in a canal bypassing the existing dam. Construction of the project will permit safe and efficient transportation through the project itself as well as complete a series of 1,200-foot by 110-foot locks from near Pittsburgh to Smithland locks and dam at river mile 918.5. Reduced delays and transportation costs will benefit directly and indirectly the economy of the Nation. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, April 8, 1982)

OREGON

Bonneville navigation lock, Oreg. and Wash.—This project is located at Bonneville lock and dam, 40 miles east of Portland, Oreg. The proposed project would provide for construction of a new lock, 86 feet wide, 675 feet long, and at least 15 feet deep. The horizontal dimensions are the same as the seven existing upstream locks. The navigation problems at Bonneville lock, including lockage delays and damages from accidents, occur due to the restricted size of the lock chamber, hazardous approaches and constricted Columbia River Channel. Waterborne commerce, which is expected to increase to 13,000,000 tons per year, will equal or exceed the lock capacity by 1988. The existing upstream locks are capable of handling the anticipated traffic beyond the year 2040. (Report of Chief of Engineers, March 14, 1980)

TEXAS

Freeport Harbor, Tex.—The project is in Brazoria County 47 miles southwest of Galveston. The plan of improvement provides for relocation of the north jetty of the entrance channel in the Gulf of Mexico. The narrow 200-foot wide jetty channel, sharp curves at the inner end of the jetty channel and at the upper end of Brazosport turning basin, and limited maneuvering areas in the existing turning basins, all contribute to inadequate conditions for safe navigation by deep-draft traffic. Because of these hazards, deep-draft vessel movements are restricted to one-way traffic, and with inadequate project depth, vessels are often light-loaded and some of the large vessels will not call at Freeport. (Flood Control Act of 1970)

UTAH

Little Dell Lake, Utah.—The project authorized by the 1968 Flood Control Act is located on Dell Creek, a tributary of Parleys Creek, about 8 miles east of Salt Lake City, Utah. The plan of improvement provides for the construction of a dam 253 feet high, creating a lake with a gross capacity of 30,000 acre-feet for flood control, municipal, and industrial water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife. The plan

includes facilities for diversion of water from Emigration Creek and from Parleys Creek. The lake would be operated in conjunction with the existing Mountain Dell Reservoir on Parleys Creek for flood control and water supply. The project would provide flood protection against snowmelt flooding in the 13th South Street area in Salt Lake City, now subject to periodic damages flood inundations from overflow of an underground conduit system that carries flows from Red Butte, Emigration and Parleys Creeks; and would reduce flood peaks along the main stem of the Jordan River through the city of Salt Lake and downstream of the city. The snowmelt flood of 1952, the largest on record in the 13th South Street area flooded about 1,500 homes, damages were estimated at \$2,570,000. Under current conditions of development and prices, these damages would amount to about \$100,000,000 most of which would be preventable by the project.

VIRGINIA

Norfolk Harbor, Va.—The project is located in Hampton Roads, Va., a 25-square mile natural harbor serving the ports of Norfolk, Newport News, Portsmouth, Chesapeake, and Hampton, Va. The recommended project provides for deepening the main channels from 45 to 55 feet and other channels to lesser depths, along with construction of fixed mooring anchorage areas. Hampton Roads is a natural roadstead of 25 square miles forming one of the finest natural harbors in the world. Domestic and foreign commerce in the port amounted to over 59,000,000 tons in 1979. The movement of this volume of waterborne commerce, together with the presence of major naval facilities, has made Hampton Roads one of the Nation's leading ports. (Report of the Chief of Engineers, November 20, 1981)

Richmond Filtration Plant, Va.—The project is located in the city of Richmond and is bordered on the north by Henrico County and on the south by Chesterfield County. The Richmond water filtration plant is located in the western portion of the city on the left bank of the James River. The project will provide for protection of the municipal water supply treatment plant. The protection of the water filtration plant from flooding is critical in order to safeguard the health and well-being of the citizens and businesses of the Richmond area. As a result of tropical storm Agnes in June 1972, the water filtration plant was flooded, and the estimated 400,000 population served was without potable water supply for over 5 days and without fire protection for 3 days. Future floods have the potential for greater damage, possibly resulting in longer outages and affecting even a greater number of people. (Water Resource Development Act of 1976)

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$8,000,000 for the initiation of three new construction starts, including two proposed by the administration, for the Bureau of Reclamation as follows:

Animas-La Plata Participating Project, Colo. and N. Mex.

Buffalo Bill Dam Modification, Wyo.

Headgate Rock Hydroelectric Project, Ariz.

Following is a brief discussion of each project:

Animas-La Plata Project, Colo. and N. Mex.—The project is located in La Plata and Montezuma Counties of southwestern Colorado and San Juan County of northern New Mexico. The project would provide irrigation water for lands in the La Plata River drainage for both Indian and non-Indian lands. Municipal and industrial water would also be provided for the Ute Mountain and Southern Ute Indian Tribes and for Durango, Farmington, and small communities in their vicinity. The project would also provide significant recreation and fish and wildlife benefits.

Buffalo Bill Dam Modification, Wyo.—Buffalo Bill Dam and the existing Shoshone Powerplant are located on the Shoshone River about 6 miles west of the city of Cody, Wyo. Buffalo Bill Dam will be raised 25 feet to enlarge the reservoir, the powerplant will be replaced with a larger one, and a visitor center will be built. The projected annual energy production is 69,700 megawatt-hours. Dikes will be constructed in the north and south fork arms of the reservoir to retain water over potential dust-producing areas, and a protective dike will be built in the Diamond Creek area to preserve existing development and use.

Headgate Rock Hydroelectric Project, Ariz.—This project is located in La Paz County, Ariz., on the Colorado River near Parker, Ariz. This project would utilize the flow of the river now passing over the spillway of Headgate Rock Dam by incorporating three 6,500-kW tube turbine generating units in three of the spillway gate sections. It would provide for a total of 19,500 kW of capacity and an average production of 86,500,000 kWh of energy for irrigation and drainage pumping and other uses on the Colorado River Indian Reservation. This energy would displace energy now purchased from Arizona Public Service Company and is equivalent to approximately 160,000 barrels of oil annually.

COMPARISONS WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), the following comparison between the new budget authority set forth in the first concurrent resolution on the budget, as allocated by the Committee on Appropriations under section 302 of the act, and the budget authority contained in the accompanying bill is provided:

Total fiscal year 1984 section 302(a) allocation	\$536,363,000,000
Current level ¹	520,202,000,000
Amount in other pending supplemental	607,000,000
Amount remaining	15,554,000,000
Committee bill	78,000,000
Net amount under allocation	15,476,000,000

¹CBO estimate of: previously enacted appropriation bills; the continuing resolution; and contingencies for mandatory items.

FIVE-YEAR PROJECTION OF OUTLAYS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), the following table contains 5-year projections of the outlays associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

Budget authority	\$78,000,000
Outlays:	
1984	50,000,000
1985	22,000,000
1986	6,000,000
1987	
1988	

ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), the new budget authority and outlays provided by the accompanying bill for financial assistance to State and local governments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1984 new budget authority	
Fiscal year 1984 outlays resulting therefrom	